

Management, is the third highest position in the Department of Homeland Security.

While this vote is long overdue, he has been approved by our committee now not once, I think, but twice. Unfortunately, we failed in the Senate to act on his nomination before the end of the last Congress, so we had to start over again. I am just glad he is willing to serve in this role.

As of this week, more than a year will have passed since the last Senate-confirmed Under Secretary for Management—a fellow named Rafael Borrás, a very good leader—stepped down from this post. I again thank Chairman JOHNSON for his efforts and our joint efforts to move this nomination forward.

Everything I have learned about Russ Deyo over the past several months has led me to conclude that he is an exceptional candidate to be the next Under Secretary for Management at DHS. Chairman JOHNSON has already walked through his impressive career.

Russ Deyo is also no stranger to public service. We tend to emphasize his very significant responsibilities at Johnson & Johnson and as a partner in a major law firm, but he has also worked with law enforcement organizations. He was an assistant U.S. attorney in New Jersey for 8 years—something we don't always note—including a period as chief of the public corruption unit. His perspective from the private and public sectors is going to be a great asset to Secretary Jeh Johnson and to Alejandro Mayorkas, the Deputy Secretary at the Department, as they work together to get the Department operating in a more unified and cohesive manner, in creating one DHS.

If confirmed, Mr. Deyo is going to face plenty of challenges. For example, the Government Accountability Office continues to remind us that the overall management of the Department remains on GAO's high-risk list of government operations that need urgent attention. Of course, if confirmed, Mr. Deyo will inherit the challenge of improving morale across the Department. I believe Mr. Deyo has the leadership, the experience, and the skills necessary to tackle these and other challenges at the Department and that he really will make a difference.

I would just say in closing that all of the organizations I have ever been a part of or observed, whether they happen to be a school or a university, a sports team, a military unit, a business, a church, the House or the Senate—here or at the local level—the most important element in the success of those organizations is almost always leadership. What we have endeavored to do over the last year, or actually a little more than a year, is to take the Department of Homeland Security—which was largely bereft at the senior levels of Senate-confirmed leadership—and with the addition of Russ Deyo in this No. 3 position to be in charge of the management shop at DHS, they

will have a full slate. They will have a full slate for not the C team or the D team or the B team but I think in many respects the A team. We expect them to rise to the challenge—there are plenty of challenges they face today—and Russ will help make that possible.

I wish to say to Russ Deyo, if he is listening: Thanks for your willingness to hang in there with us until we could get to confirmation.

To the Deyo family: We appreciate very much your willingness to share your spouse and in this case your dad with the people of this Nation. We need him. We will put him to good work, and after a while we will send him back to you safe and sound.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF RUSSELL C. DEYO TO BE UNDER SECRETARY FOR MANAGEMENT, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

NOMINATION OF JONODEV OSCEOLA CHAUDHURI TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL INDIAN GAMING COMMISSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nominations of Russell C. Deyo, of New Jersey, to be Under Secretary for Management, Department of Homeland Security; and Jonodev Osceola Chaudhuri, of Arizona, to be Chairman of the National Indian Gaming Commission for the term of three years.

VOTE ON DEYO NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Russell C. Deyo, of New Jersey, to be Under Secretary for Management, Department of Homeland Security?

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the Deyo nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 95, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 154 Ex.]

YEAS—95

Alexander	Flake	Murray
Ayotte	Franken	Nelson
Baldwin	Gardner	Paul
Barrasso	Gillibrand	Perdue
Bennet	Graham	Peters
Blumenthal	Grassley	Portman
Blunt	Hatch	Reed
Booker	Heinrich	Reid
Boozman	Heitkamp	Risch
Brown	Heller	Roberts
Burr	Hirono	Rounds
Cantwell	Hoeven	Sanders
Capito	Inhofe	Sasse
Cardin	Isakson	Schatz
Carper	Johnson	Schumer
Casey	Kaine	Scott
Cassidy	King	Sessions
Coats	Kirk	Shaheen
Cochran	Klobuchar	Shelby
Collins	Lankford	Stabenow
Coons	Leahy	Sullivan
Corker	Manchin	Tester
Cornyn	Markey	Thune
Cotton	McCain	Tillis
Crapo	McCaskill	Toomey
Daines	McConnell	Udall
Donnelly	Menendez	Warner
Durbin	Merkley	Warren
Enzi	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Ernst	Moran	Wicker
Feinstein	Murkowski	Wyden
Fischer	Murphy	

NAYS—2

Lee Vitter

NOT VOTING—3

Boxer Cruz Rubio

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON CHAUDHURI NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Jonodev Osceola Chaudhuri, of Arizona, to be Chairman of the National Indian Gaming Commission for the term of three years?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

Mr. SCHATZ. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2015—Continued

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I am going to have, later on—I was hoping

we would be able to do this today—a couple of amendments that I can't imagine will be any problem on the floor. But it has been a problem that has been with us for a long period of time, and we are in a position to do something about it.

Due to a couple of Supreme Court cases, ICE cannot detain convicted criminal aliens awaiting deportation beyond 6 months. So what they have to do is—they have no choice—they have to put them back into the community, and they are back where they can continue to commit the same crimes that they committed before.

In 2013, over 36,000 criminal immigrants with over 88,000 convictions were released back into our communities, including convictions of over 100 commercialized sexual offences, over 700 sexual offences, and many others. But that is 36,000, all in 1 year. Now, since that time, 176,000 of nondetained convicted criminals have gone back into our society. This is something I can't imagine anyone would want to continue.

My amendment would allow for the government to renew detention of these criminal aliens every 6 months to determine, should they be returned to society, what the risk is. Then we can let justice take place. But it does away with that prohibition of anything over 6 months. So we have people out there right now—167,000 alien criminals—who very likely could repeat their crimes. That is my amendment No. 275.

Amendment No. 276. Last summer, we saw tens of thousands of kids come across our southern border. Some were housed in my State of Oklahoma at Fort Sill. This summer, experts are predicting another wave of children from Central America. This is the problem. If these were kids who came over from either Canada or Mexico, we could do something about it. We could actually send them back and have some authority.

But as it is right now, if one of them comes from Central America, even though they come through Mexico, they are citizens of a Central American country, and so we cannot do that.

I have an amendment that would—well, in fact, our situation in Oklahoma is that we had several hundred who were just put there, and what do you do with a bunch of kids? So they put them in Fort Sill, and they had a place where they could temporarily put them down. Then they kind of disappeared.

I had occasion to go into Los Fresnos in southern Texas. That is one of the largest centers where they will put these kids.

I went in there. They didn't really want me to go in there, take pictures, and see what was going on. But in that particular center—I am going from memory now. I think they had a total of 80 beds—only 80 kids at the time.

I asked the question: How many kids have come through here in the last 6 months?

And they said: Over thousands and thousands.

I said: Wait a minute. If you had thousands, where are they now?

They couldn't answer that.

So what happens is the kids come in, they temporarily identify them, and then they disappear into society.

Now, with this change, all we are doing is treating these kids who would be coming into this country by giving our enforcement officers the latitude and the opportunity to send them back or to let them go back voluntarily. Right now, they can't even go back voluntarily once they cross the line coming into this country.

That is amendment No. 276. It is one that we will be considering and hopefully getting a vote on when we return early next week.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASIDY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. FRANKEN pertaining to the introduction of S. 993 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. FRANKEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMEMORATING VIRGINIA TECH SHOOTING

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I rise today to commemorate a horrible tragedy, to honor a community, and to challenge this Congress. Eight years ago today I was the Governor of Virginia. I had just landed in Japan to begin a 2-week trade mission in Japan and India, and there was a knock on my hotel room door. State Police informed me there had been a horrible shooting on the campus of one of my State universities, Virginia Tech. We turned on CNN—that far away around the world—and saw the news unfold, the horrific events of that day. We went back to the airport, and we flew back home and spent weeks, months, and then years dealing with the aftermath of this horrible tragedy.

Thirty-two wonderful Americans, Virginians, and folks from around the world—students, professors, and graduate students of Virginia Tech—lost

their lives that day. If you will allow me, I want to read their names into the RECORD:

Ross Alameddine, Jamie Bishop, Brian Bluhm, Ryan Clark, Austin Michelle Cloyd, Jocelyne Couture-Nowak, Daniel Alejandro Perez Cueva, Kevin Granata, Matthew Gwaltney, Caitlin Hammaren, Jeremy Herbstritt, Rachael Elizabeth Hill, Emily Hilscher, Jarrett Lane, Matthew La Porte, Henry Lee, Liviu Librescu, G.V. Loganathan, Partahi Mamora Halomoan Lumbantoruan, Lauren McCain, Daniel O'Neil, Juan Ramon Ortiz, Minal Panchal, Erin Peterson, Michael Pohle, Julia Pryde, Mary Karen Read, Reema Samaha, Waleed Mohammed Shaalan, Leslie Sherman, Maxine Turner, and Nicole White.

Thirty-two precious, precious people of amazing accomplishment and even more amazing promise. Seventeen others were shot that day and wounded. Six others were not shot but were injured leaping from windows in a classroom building to escape the carnage. And so many others were affected: first responders, pastors, counselors, and the entire Hokie Nation. That is what we call the Virginia Tech community.

I know there has been a presentation on the floor about mental health issues and first responders. Some of the most painful discussions I had were in the aftermath of the shooting. I had many with family members and students who were injured, but some of the most painful were from the first responders. The EMTs on the scene included students who were volunteering at the campus EMT operation. Their description of this carnage they walked into, as horrible as the carnage was—the physical carnage—the thing that many of them told me was the most difficult for them to get over was walking into classrooms where there were dead bodies and hearing in pockets and backpacks next to these prone forms the vibrating and ringing of cell phones from parents and friends who had seen the news on TV and were reaching out to try to find out whether their friend or their child was safe. Those unanswered phones were deeply, deeply difficult to those who were the responders.

I have friends who were pastors and counselors in the Blacksburg community. And their own experiences years later have profoundly transformed their lives. Even in tragedy, though, you can see examples of resilience and remarkable spirit. The Virginia Tech community, the Hokie Nation, on that day demonstrated resilience and in the years since. I do stand to honor that spirit and resilience of the entire community, even as we acknowledge the horrible tragedy.

Two years ago on this day we were in the midst of a grim debate on this floor inspired by another horrific shooting—the murder of schoolchildren in Newtown, CT. I stood on the floor and talked about the shooting at Virginia Tech and the lessons we had learned. I

told the story of just one of the victims. It is sort of unfair to single out a person because all were so special, but one of the victims who was killed that day was a professor of engineering, Liviu Librescu, Romanian-born, who survived the Holocaust and who survived the Soviet takeover of his native country, only to be killed by gun violence in America as he barred the door to his classroom to stop the shooter from entering so that his students could safely escape. He survived the Holocaust, survived the depredation imposed on his country by Soviet communism and was killed by gun violence at Virginia Tech University in Virginia in this country.

I want to tell you today about two students who were shot that day but survived. They offer a powerful lesson about the resilient human spirit and also offer a challenge to this body.

Colin Goddard was a senior just weeks away from graduation. He was badly wounded. He was shot four times that day. My wife Anne and I visited him in the hospital 2 days after the shooting. We see him and his parents often. They live in Richmond, where we live.

In the years since his graduation, Colin has become a passionate advocate for gun safety, especially focusing on the need for a national system of background record checks. He helped produce and was part of an award-winning documentary about his friends. The documentary is called "Living for 32," and it is very powerful.

Elilita "Lily" Habtu was also a senior, and she was majoring in psychology. She was shot and badly injured that day. She is with us today in the Senate Gallery. Lily was already focused on helping people, but the shooting put her on a new path. Along with other survivors, she founded Students for Gun Free Schools, a grassroots movement to keep campuses safe. She received a master's degree in conflict analysis and resolution from George Mason University, and she has used that training to work on a number of gun safety issues. She also served as an intern at the White House.

I could tell wonderful stories about many of the others who were killed or injured, and all of them are precious. I hope to do that in the years to come because I have a feeling I will stand on this floor often on April 16. I focused on Colin and Lily today because of their passionate work for gun safety.

In the aftermath of the shooting at Virginia Tech, I commissioned a panel to review what went wrong that day. Lawyers said: Don't do that. People could use it to bring lawsuits against the State.

I said: No. We have to know what went wrong. We have to know what we can do to reduce the chance this will ever happen again. We will not be able to eliminate violence. We will not be able to eliminate shootings. But at least we can reduce the chance if we learn what went wrong.

My panel dug into it and made recommendations about mental health, campus safety protocol, first responders, the training of campus personnel, and about gun safety. These detailed recommendations led to numerous changes in State and Federal best practices and laws, and I saw legislators from both parties work together, with strong public support, to make changes so our campuses would be safer.

Mr. President, I would not be honest if I didn't say there was one recommendation by my panel that was opposed both at the State and Federal levels—the institution of a comprehensive background record check system to keep weapons out of the hands of dangerous individuals. I wish to talk today about that continuing failure.

The Virginia Tech student who killed and wounded so many, Seung-Hui Cho, should never have been able to purchase weapons at all. He had been adjudicated in a court in the Commonwealth of Virginia as mentally ill and dangerous and was thus barred by Federal law from purchasing or owning weapons. That is a longstanding Federal law, but the Federal law is only as good as the background record check system that is able to determine when someone purchases a weapon if they have, in fact, been adjudicated mentally ill and dangerous. Because the record of his adjudication had not been entered into the national NICS database, he slipped through the cracks, and this troubled individual illegally bought the weapons that destroyed so many lives and removed so much promise from this Earth.

We fixed the narrow issue that led to Seung-Hui Cho's adjudication being left out of the database. I did it by executive order. My legislature confirmed it at the Federal level. Laws were passed and signed into law by President Bush to encourage States to enter mental health adjudications into the Federal database—a database that in the last 20 years has succeeded at stopping more than 2 million people from making illegal gun purchases.

But just months later, as Governor, when I tried to make sure we performed background record checks on everybody, especially those who purchased guns at gun shows, which account for a huge portion of the gun purchases in the United States—there is no law requiring background record checks at gun shows. When I made that effort, my general assembly basically caved in to pressure from a Virginia organization—the National Rifle Association—and other groups, and they voted against background record checks.

Two years ago, as a Senator, during the very week we were commemorating the anniversary of the most horrific shooting to ever happen on a college campus in the history of the United States and in the shadow of the horrific shootings in Newtown, CT, we tried to create a uniform background record check system at the Federal level, but the same groups that fought

against us in Virginia fought against background checks here.

Even in the shadow of the horrific shootings of the little kids in Newtown—and since the Newtown shootings, more than 70,000 Americans have been killed by gun violence in this country—we still lack a comprehensive background record check system. It is estimated that 40 percent of all of the guns that are sold in the United States occur with no background record check.

The Presiding Officer knows the law. Convicted felons are not lawfully allowed to purchase their own weapons, but without a comprehensive background record check system, they can and they do. People who have been adjudicated mentally ill and dangerous are not lawfully allowed to purchase their own weapons, but without a comprehensive background record check system, they can and they do. Domestic violence perpetrators who have been placed under protective orders are not lawfully allowed to purchase their own weapons, but without a comprehensive background record check system, they can and they do.

So why not fix our laws to create a record check system so we can keep weapons out of the hands of those who are not legally allowed to have them? Why are groups such as the NRA so passionately opposed to keeping guns out of the hands of dangerous people?

I am particularly interested in the NRA's position on this issue because I know the organization very well. The NRA is headquartered in Virginia. I know many NRA members. When I was the mayor of Richmond and I helped implement an antigun program—Project Exile—that would send gun criminals to Federal prison, the NRA supported our effort. So why is the NRA opposed to background record checks?

The NRA opposes background record checks even though American gun owners and even NRA members have frequently indicated strong support for background record checks in polling.

The NRA opposes background record checks even though their avowed principles would suggest that they would support such laws. For example, the NRA has been fond of saying: We don't need new gun laws; we just need to enforce existing gun laws. That is exactly what a background record check does. It makes no change in the law as to who can and cannot have a weapon; it just enables us to enforce existing laws to stop dangerous people, such as Seung-Hui Cho, from purchasing weapons.

The NRA has also famously said that we should not take guns out of the hands of law-abiding citizens; we should instead focus on getting guns away from criminals. Again, that is exactly what a background record check system does. It only stops people from purchasing weapons if they are legally prohibited from purchasing weapons.

If gun owners and NRA members support background checks in polls, and if

the NRA's own principles suggest that background checks are in tune with their philosophy, why have they fought so hard and so long to keep our Nation from having a comprehensive background check system? I have pondered that question since 2007 because that day was one of the worst days of my life. I spent a lot of time thinking about it and thinking about what I ought to do as a citizen and elected official to reduce the chance that anybody will ever have to go through that experience again.

After pondering the question of why any legitimate organization would fight against background record checks, the only purpose of which is to keep guns out of the hands of dangerous people who are not legally allowed to have them, I have come to the conclusion that there is only one answer, and the answer is this: The NRA does not really speak for or represent American gun owners. Instead, they speak for and represent and, most importantly, receive funding from gun manufacturers. If you make guns, it is in your financial interest to sell as many guns as you can to whomever you can, whenever you can, and wherever you can. And I believe that is the reason so many States and even Congress are not able to pass background record check laws to keep us safer.

Mr. President, let me be self-critical. I would not call out the NRA if I were not about to do what I am about to do. I will bring it home and talk about Congress. If the NRA is now beholden to gun manufacturers, I have to be honest enough to admit that Congress can hardly be self-righteous about this. I would argue that Congress is equally beholden to gun manufacturers as well.

As the Presiding Officer knows, Congress generally leaves the question of tort law as a matter for States to resolve. We generally don't have big tort reform at the Federal level. Republicans often advance notions of States' rights and oppose Federal laws that trump State laws. Democrats are generally against efforts that block plaintiffs' access to State courts to seek redress for injuries. So, in some ways, both Republican and Democratic principles have tended to be opposed to tort reform at the national level.

But here is an unusual example. In 2005, 10 years ago, both Democrats and Republicans joined together to support a major Federal tort reform act, the Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act, and that act restricts the ability of people to bring lawsuits against firearm manufacturers in State or Federal court for negligent use of firearms. This 2005 act, which was a bipartisan one in this body—13 Democrats joined with Republicans to pass it—is highly unusual because if you look through the entire United States Code, you are not going to find many national, Federal-level tort laws that shield entire industries from State court claims based on negligence. There may be another one, but I don't

know what it is. This is a highly unusual shielding of an entire industry—the gun manufacturing industry—from State and Federal claims based on negligence. This industry uniquely receives this very special protection from the Congress of the United States.

When the law was passed in this body and signed into law by President Bush, plaintiffs in State courts whose cases were being tried had to immediately close down their cases. Plaintiffs who had won cases and had cases on appeal immediately had their cases dismissed. This does not happen often, but for gun manufacturers, in this Congress, it has happened.

I will conclude by saying this: We have to make a decision about what is important. We have to make decisions every day about what is important. Should we keep weapons out of the hands of dangerous people, people who are prohibited by law from having them—if you think the answer is yes, then you should support background check laws—or should we embrace a policy that is based on the notion that we should sell as many guns as we can to whomever we can, whenever we can, and wherever we can? Because that is the current state of the law with an inadequate background check system. It serves no one's interest other than gun manufacturers', but the human cost is incalculably high.

As we commemorate the shooting at Virginia Tech, honoring those we lost and those brave survivors, such as Colin and Lily, who are using their painful experience to help others, and honoring the resilience of the entire Hokie Nation, it is my hope that my colleagues will get serious about gun safety.

I am a gun owner and a proud supporter of the Second Amendment, but the time is long overdue for a comprehensive background check system that keeps weapons out of the hands of dangerous people like Seung-Hui Cho. I look forward to the day when we will accomplish this and have a safer nation as a result.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HONORING VIETNAM VETERANS AND NORTH DAKOTA'S SOLDIERS WHO LOST THEIR LIVES IN VIETNAM

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I rise again to speak about and honor our Nation's and North Dakota's Vietnam veterans, and, through my continuing series of floor speeches, specifically those brave servicemembers who gave the ultimate sacrifice.

As you know, we are in the midst of a commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the Vietnam war. This special

period of honoring our Vietnam veterans runs through 2025. I have partnered with students from Bismarck High School in researching these soldiers, and once again I thank their instructors Laura Forde, Sara Rinas, and Allison Wendel for coordinating this project and sharing their students' research with my office.

Last month, I visited these students and was so impressed with their commitment to this project. I want to say thank you again to the Bismarck High 11th graders and their teachers for helping us gather important information about the lives of these servicemembers.

This week, I am especially happy to be able to include information they helped to find about the lives of Tom Alderson and John Tingley. I am also grateful to my friend Jim Nelson, a Vietnam veteran, who is dedicated to making sure each of these soldiers' immediate relatives receives a Gold Star Family member pin and certificate.

I was happy to be part of Jim's ceremony in Bismarck last year in honoring these soldiers and their families. Through this effort, I hope to make sure our Nation never forgets the needs of our Vietnam veterans and the sacrifices of those who fell in service to our country.

There were 198 sons of North Dakota who did not make it home from the Vietnam War. One hundred ninety-eight sons of North Dakota gave their lives for their country and their State. Today, I am honored to tell you about a few of them.

CLIFTON "CLIFF" CUSHMAN

First is Clifton "Cliff" Cushman. Cliff was from Grand Forks and was born on June 2, 1938. He served in the Air Force—the 469th Tactical Fighter Squadron. Cliff was 28 years old when he went missing on September 25, 1966.

Cliff left behind his widow Carolyn and their son Colin, born just days before Cliff learned that he would be deployed to Vietnam. Colin was 9 months old when Cliff left for Vietnam.

Everyone in Grand Forks knows the name of Cushman because Cliff was a standout athlete and a Silver Medalist in the 1960 Olympics in the 400 meter hurdles. Grand Forks named their high school football stadium Cushman Field after Cliff.

Grand Forks kids are still inspired annually by the reading of the 1964 letter Cliff wrote to students about effort, after he fell while attempting to qualify for the 1964 Olympics. This is a quote from Cliff's letter: "I would much rather fail knowing I had put forth an honest effort than never to have tried at all." Later in the same letter, Cliff wrote: "Unless your reach exceeds your grasp, how can you be sure what you can attain?"

THOMAS "TOM" ALDERSON

I want to talk about Thomas Alderson. Tom was from Grand Forks. He was born on September 9, 1941. He served as a captain in the Army's 56th medical company. He died October 3,

1968, at the age of 27. He was survived by his wife, mother, brother, and two sisters.

Tom was an Army dental officer in the Vietnam Dental Corps. His father-in-law was his commanding officer.

In high school, he was an honor student and lettered in basketball, track, and tennis. He attended the University of North Dakota and the University of Minnesota, where he earned his dental degree in 1966.

In Vietnam, Tom was in charge of several dental offices, which required travel throughout the country. Tom's driver in Vietnam wrote the family a letter explaining that even as a dentist, Tom was ducking mortars all day long during his service.

RAYMOND "RAY" KRAMER

Next, Ray Kramer. Ray was from New Salem and he was born December 31, 1946. He served in the Army's 1st Infantry Division.

Ray died on February 2, 1968. He was 21 years old. Ray was the sixth of nine children. His brother, Cecil, also served in the Army. Ray's nephew, Cody, is very proud of his Uncle Ray's service.

Ray grew up on the farm where his family raised grain and dairy cows. He was an honor student at New Salem High School and later worked as a dedicated carpenter. Ray's sister, Beverly, remembers that Ray's dog loved him so much that he slept under Ray's car while Ray was in Vietnam. After Ray was killed in action, his parents left the farm and moved to town. His sister took Ray's dog to her farm 10 miles away, but the dog ran all the way back home to wait for Ray under his car.

RONALD "CHRISTY" GOODIRON

Ronald Christy Goodiron was from Shields and was born December 23, 1947. He served in the Marine Corps' 3rd Battalion, 5th Marines.

Christy was 20 years old when he died on February 28, 1968. His father Paul Goodiron served in World War I and was a code talker. Christy's close cousin, Paul Goodiron, also served in Vietnam. Unfortunately, Paul unexpectedly died last month. Paul's son, CPL Nathan Goodiron, was also killed in action in 2006 serving his country in the U.S. Army National Guard in Afghanistan.

Christy's family remembers him as smiling all the time. Today, they honor him at powwows by raising the American flag they received when he died and singing the Vietnam "Warrior's Song" to honor Christy.

Christy's family appreciates reading what his fellow marines serving with him wrote about their memories of him and the account of what happened the day he died.

RONALD "RON" BOND

Maj. Ronald Bond was from Fargo and was born on July 30, 1930. He served in the Air Force's 604th Air Commando Squadron. He was 37 years old when he went missing May 11, 1968.

Ron was the oldest of six kids and the first in his family to attend col-

lege. Ron's family remembers him as an adventuresome spirit. He loved hunting, fishing, water skiing, and even competitive sailing with his wife.

Ron's military career began as a Naval ROTC Cadet in his first year at North Dakota State University. Ron then served in the Naval Reserve, enlisted in the Navy, and upon discharge immediately enlisted in the Air Force.

Despite an aircraft accident that injured his spine, Ron became a flight instructor and flew in more missions until he was killed in action in Vietnam. His body has never been recovered.

GARY LOKKEN

Gary Lokken was from Bowman and was born on July 2, 1941. He served in the Army Reserve's Engineering CMD. He was 26 years old when he died on April 10, 1968. Gary left behind his widow Paige and infant twins, a boy and a girl. The twins were 10 days old when Gary left for basic training.

Gary was a medical doctor, who studied in North Dakota and Texas. He completed his medical internship in Hawaii and planned to return there with his family to live after his service. Six months after arriving in Vietnam, Gary was killed while transporting patients when his vehicle hit a landmine.

His twins both entered the medical field. His son is a histology technician and his daughter a medical doctor.

WILLIAM "BILL" ECKES

William "Bill" Eckes was from Beach. He was born on September 20, 1940. He served in the Navy as a Petty Officer First Class journalist. Bill died March 10, 1967. He was 26 years old.

Bill was the oldest of seven children. His father was an Army sergeant in World War II. Bill was a well-known football player for Beach High School. He was on his second tour of duty in the Navy as a journalist when his aircraft crashed in South Vietnam.

He previously wrote for Stars and Stripes while he was stationed in Sicily and Iceland. Margot, Bill's sister closest in age, remembers him as an intelligent, determined person whose plan was to come home after attending the University of North Dakota and have a career in the Foreign Service.

JEROME ELLENSON

Jerome Ellenson was from Walcott and was born on April 3, 1946. He served in the Army's 196th Infantry Brigade. Jerome died on January 10, 1968. He was 20 years old.

Jerome was the fifth of seven children. Jerome's oldest sister, Margie, remembers him as having a unique love of life, being a great storyteller, and everyone's friend.

Margie tells about how Jerome would often give his family side aches because he had made them laugh so much on long car trips. Jerome didn't say goodbye to anyone when he left for Vietnam.

His family was told he was the last survivor of his unit; that he manned the radio until his death.

CHESTER "SKIP" COONS

Chester "Skip" Coons was from Bismark. He was born March 29, 1936. He served in the Navy's Observation Squadron 67. He was 31 years old on February 17, 1968, when he went missing.

Skip and his two brothers, Larry and Ronald, all served in the Navy. Their mother Elsie still lives in Bismark and is 95 years old. Skip left behind two young daughters who were thankful to meet fellow sky sailors of their dad's old unit.

Skip had planned to make a career out of the military. In high school, he joined the North Dakota National Guard, then he joined the Air Force for 3 years, and later joined the Navy as a pilot. He was on his third tour of duty in Vietnam when his plane was shot down on a reconnaissance mission over Laos. In 1993, his remains were finally recovered.

RICHARD BURINGRUD

Richard Buringrud was from Argusville and was born on November 24, 1946. He served in the Army 12th Infantry Regiment. Richard died on June 9, 1969. He was 22 years old.

Richard loved softball and playing basketball in high school. Richard's father still lives in Fargo and his family remembers the letters he sent home describing having been in a swamp, which was the first kind of bath he had in a week.

Richard was an expert rifleman and was killed when he went ahead of his armored unit to help clear the way.

BRENT SVEEN

Brent Sveen was from Harwood and went to high school in West Fargo. He was born October 25, 1951. He was 18 years old when he died on September 7, 1970.

Brent's father also served in the Army in World War II. Brent's older brother Bruce, a marine, served two tours of duty in Vietnam.

Brent's sisters, Jean and Ava, remember Brent as befriending everyone, being the life of the party, and having a great sense of humor and wit.

Brent's sisters cherish one family picture in particular. Their older brother Bruce was wearing his marine uniform. Before taking the picture, Brent disappeared. He returned wearing his dad's old World War II Army uniform and the family took the picture with both boys in uniform.

Having an older brother serve in Vietnam, Brent could have waived out of his own service, but he was eager to serve his country and enlisted while in high school. Shortly before he died, Brent wrote this poem he mailed to his parents.

I think of my buddy I was talking to yesterday;

Now he's lying on the ground not far away;
They say he's dead, but I hope it's not true;
And if it is, to ease my tears I'll think of you.

I looked down at his body and began to cry;
I turned to the clouds and asked, God, why?
I waited awhile, but no answer came;

Only the unceasing falling rain.

I want to thank Brent's sister Jean Kraft for participating in this project. Jean joined me recently in a visit to the Bismarck High School sharing her own family's stories and encouraging these students to reach out to families and to learn about the lives of these young men whom we lost in Vietnam. She is among my very favorite people and a hero herself.

PETER BINSTOCK, JR.

Peter Binstock, Jr., was from New England. He was born May 5, 1947. He served in the Army as an Armor Recon Specialist. He died on January 3, 1969. He was 21 years old.

Peter was the oldest of 11 children. His family had eight girls and three boys. Peter planned on taking over the family farm when he returned from Vietnam. His sister Rose remembers Peter as always being in good spirits. While he was in Vietnam, he was fondly called "Big Pete" because he was 6 feet 3 inches and very strong. He was promoted to corporal after his death.

RONALD KENT

Ronald Kent. Ronald was from Page and was born April 21, 1943. He served in the Army 25th Infantry Division. He was 23 years old when he died on January 20, 1967.

Ronald was one of eight children. His family remembers him as a fearless man. He was small in stature but big in spirit. His sister Candice remembers that Ronald loved the outdoors, and he had the ability to talk his nieces and nephews into anything, including cleaning his car.

A few years ago, Ronald's brother Steven spoke to the young men who carried Ronald's body back to the base after he was killed. After hearing the description of that day, Steven knows that in those final moments, all that Ronald was thinking about was saving his brothers-in-arms.

WARD EVANS

Ward Evans. Ward was from Harwood, and he was born February 22, 1940. He served in the Army 5th Infantry Division. He died on February 8, 1969. He was 28 years old. Ward was the youngest of five children. His family remembers him as someone who was always ready to help others. His sister Maryann remembers that when he came home from Vietnam on a break, he seemed sad and that the war had gotten to him, but he went back to complete his duty.

On February 8, 1969, almost all the men near Ward were killed. When the chopper came back to pick up the survivors, Ward demanded to stay behind in order to rescue three men who were still alive but also wounded. While tending to the injured soldiers, Ward stepped on a land mine.

Ward's nephew Mark is so proud of him and will always remember Ward as a man who did what was right no matter what the personal cost.

JOHN TINGLEY

John Tingley was from Kathryn. He was born on August 19, 1946. He served

in the Army 128th Aviation Company. He was 21 years old at the time of his death, January 10, 1968.

John was one of six children born in 8 years. John's sister Mary remembers John as someone who did it all. He played the trombone in band, sang in the choir, was a member of the 4H Club, and played sports. He had a photographic memory and his sister knew he would have had an enormously bright future.

In Vietnam, John was a helicopter gunner crew chief. The day he was killed, John's helicopter was responding to a helicopter that had just gone down. While they were going to assist soldiers involved in the crash, he was shot and killed.

All of these young men serving their country and serving each other remind us of the sacrifices we have experienced in war. They remind us that there are so many among us who will run to the sound of the guns and protect our freedom. We cannot let their sacrifice ever be forgotten.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, we are continuing to make progress on the bipartisan antitrafficking bill. Senator CORNYN is working with Chairman GRASSLEY and Senators on both sides of the aisle to resolve the remaining issues.

It is my hope we will be able to go through an orderly amendment process and pass the trafficking bill early next week. The Senate will then consider the Lynch nomination through the regular order, as I have already committed to doing, followed by consideration of the Iran bill as reported unanimously by the Foreign Relations Committee earlier this week.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 1191

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader, with the concurrence of the Democratic leader, the Senate proceed to vote on the motion to proceed to calendar No. 30, H.R. 1191, and that if the motion to proceed is agreed to, Senator CORKER or his designee be recognized to offer a substitute amendment, which is the text of S. 615 as reported by the Foreign Relations Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The minority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I reserve my right to object, and would say that with the work done by Senators MURRAY and all the Judiciary Committee, led by Senator LEAHY and, of course, Senator KLOBUCHAR, working with Senator CORNYN, significant progress has

been made. There is no question in that regard. But we are not there yet. Remember, we had a problem with this initially because of the language in the bill. So every word is going to have to be read with this new language that is drawn up, and then we will see if we can make it to the finish line. I think we can, but we are certainly not there yet. But progress has been made.

Mr. President, in my reservation to object I would say that I note that the request the majority leader propounded is seeking to move to a House revenue bill, which of course would provide a vehicle for the Foreign Relations Committee-reported Iran legislation. I support the Committee-reported Iran legislation. I commend Senators CARDIN and CORKER for their historic work on this package. I do hope the Senate can pass it with no changes.

But I note that the majority leader is once again choosing not to move to the nomination of Loretta Lynch as Attorney General. It has been more than 5 months—it will be 6 months in a week or 10 days—since President Obama nominated her. Her nomination has been on the Senate calendar for 49 days, longer than the last 7 Attorney General nominations combined.

So I ask whether the majority leader would modify his consent request to add this: That there be 2 hours for debate, divided in the usual form, and that following the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote on the nomination; further, that if the nomination is confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action. Part of the consent request is that on Monday, April 20, at 3:30 p.m., the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 21.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the majority leader so modify his request?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, as I have indicated, gosh, at least for 6 weeks now, we are going to deal with the Lynch nomination right after we finish trafficking.

I am optimistic that we will be able to do trafficking in 1 day. There is not a huge demand for amendments. As I have assured my friend the Democratic leader and our colleagues, then we will move forward on the nominee for Attorney General.

Therefore, I object to the modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection to the modification is heard.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, continuing my reservation, as the majority leader is well aware, procedurally, the Senate provides many opportunities for delay. We are not going to treat the current majority the way the Republican minority treated us when we were in the majority. I am not going to object to the majority leader's consent today. However, I want everyone to know—I

am going to serve notice right now—that Ms. Lynch's nomination will not remain in purgatory forever.

So I withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HIGHER EDUCATION REAUTHORIZATION

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of my remarks to the American Council on Education.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIGHER EDUCATION REAUTHORIZATION

I am here today to read you a letter and ask for your help. I'm going to be very specific. First, I want to thank Chancellors Kirwan and Zeppos for the work they've done with others at the request of four United States senators: two Democrats and two Republicans, Senator Mikulski and Senator Bennett on the Democratic side and Senator Burr and myself on the Republican side.

We asked them to not give us a sermon but to give us specific recommendations for exactly what to do about the problem of over-regulation of higher education, and they've done that. The English professors on your campuses would be very pleased with it because it's actually recommended in plain English with mostly declarative sentences. It's an unusual report. It's very well done. And the way things work in Washington, it reminds me a lot of the report called "Rise Above Gathering Storm" that the National Academy of Sciences sponsored about ten years ago, and Norm Augustine headed it. We basically said, "Just give us ten specific things to do, and if you do, we'll probably do most of them." They gave us 20 recommendations, and we've done most of them.

So this is really a blueprint or an agenda for the United States Congress and the United States Secretary of Education to act on the problem. I want to thank Molly Broad for her work at ACE on this and for organizing it and Terry Hartle and Anne Hickey, who are staff members there. There's Christina West at Vanderbilt University, who worked hard on the report. At the University System of Maryland, there's PJ Hogan, and Andrew LaCasse on our staff in the Senate. They did a terrific job.

Now, what I'm supposed to do here is take 10 or 12 minutes and then sit down and see what questions or suggestions you have with the chancellors. So, I thought the best way to do that was to read you a letter and come close to telling you a story. One of my friends was the late Alex Haley, the author of *Roots*. After I made a speech one time, he came up after and said, "May I make a suggestion?" I said, "Well of course." He said, "If before you make a speech, you say, 'Instead of making a speech let me tell you story,' people may actually listen to what you have to say." So, let me begin with a short story.

I got this over the weekend from someone I don't know. It's from a president from a University in Missouri, handwritten, and says, among other things, "I've been in higher education administration for over 40 years, the last 20 as a university president, and I've never experienced the amount of regulatory pressure that our institution currently faces."

I hear that in lots of different ways, and this report is an expression of what to do about that. For example, this isn't just a sermon, as I mentioned. There are 59 specific suggestions about what to do. In testimony before our committee, almost everyone who testified said that requiring students to fill out the FAFSA form in their senior year and providing tax information before they file their taxes makes no sense. It would make a lot more sense to do it the year before. Almost everybody said that we should do that.

So, in this report are 59 recommendations, and what I want to ask you to do is organize yourselves in your own state and make an appointment with your member of the United States Congress. And get six or seven members of the university and sit down and talk about this report, and say, "Now we worked two years on this. This is serious business. It costs a lot of money. It discourages a lot of students from coming to our colleges, and we'd like for you to support the legislation Senator Alexander and Senator Mikulski and Senator Burr and Senator Bennett are introducing in order to implement the report." You might add Senator Murray of Washington who is the ranking Democrat on the committee as she will be deeply involved in this as well.

Sometimes university presidents come to Washington to meet with members of Congress. That's the biggest waste of time I can think of. We're all running around here with 15-minute schedules trying to keep up with things and have many more requests for appointments than we have time to see or pay attention to. But almost every single senator who is on the committee that is going to deal with this is home every weekend, and the senator from Tennessee, with all due respect, doesn't really want to see the president of the University of Maryland. He would like to see the president of the University of Tennessee or of Vanderbilt or of Milligan College or Maryville College or Rhodes College. If five or six or eight of those presidents say, "Senator Alexander, may we have a 30-minute appointment with you while you're home next month?", I'll do it in a minute. So will every other senator. And you have the credibility to go to that member of Congress and say, "Will you please vote for this? Will you cosponsor the legislation? Will you support it? Will you encourage the president to sign it?" Odds are, if you do that they will. It's about that simple.

There are a lot of things we work on up here about which we have big partisan differences. There is no reason to have any big partisan differences over this. There are a few things in it that get haggles up on the left and the right, but most things aren't like that at all. There is just the accumulation of eight reauthorizations of the Higher Education Act beginning in 1965, and you know exactly what happens. A well-meaning group of senators, congressmen, education secretaries, regulators come up with an idea and said, "Let's do this, or here's a good idea let's make everybody do that." And they just keep doing that until pretty soon you get a stack of regulations that's twice as tall as I am. You're looking at the Higher Education Act, and that's how tall it actually is. Nobody's weeded the garden. Well, this is an effort to weed the garden. So, I read a letter. I've asked for your help, and your help is very specific.

Will you please make an appointment in your home state, starting with the 22 members of the Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee and say to us, "We hope you'll vote for and support that."

Now, you'll all recognize this. This is what 20 million parents fill out every single year. And lots of colleges have said, "Well we like this information." You have to think about how much you like it. Does it really work? Asking 20 million families to fill out 108 questions like this every year just to get a grant or loan to go to college? A testimony before our committee said we could get it down to two questions: what's your family income, and what's the size of your family? Maybe it's two, maybe it's four, maybe it's 10, maybe it's 12. President Obama in his budget advocated for removing about thirty of those questions, so that takes it down from 108 to about 78.

What's the importance of that? The importance of it is pretty obvious. The importance of it is that it saves money, it saves time, and the president of the community college in Memphis, Southwest Tennessee Community College, told me he thinks he loses 1,500 students every semester because of the complexity of the form that impair students that would like to go to college.

The second story you'd like to know is Chancellor Zeppos's story about how much it costs at Vanderbilt every year to comply with federal regulations on higher education: \$150 million for one institution, \$11,000 or \$12,000 for everyone to add onto their tuition. That's just ridiculous. That's absolutely absurd.

Now, another fact is that the National Academy of Sciences says, and they've done two reports to verify this, that investigators of federally-sponsored research at colleges and universities spend 42 percent of their time on administrative matters. Now we spend \$30 billion, we taxpayers at colleges and universities on research. How much of that money is spent on administrative? Well, Chancellor Zeppos said that at Vanderbilt—and I think I've got my figures right—that about \$136 million of the \$146 was allocated for research. So, the way I figured it, about 25 percent of all the research money he gets at Vanderbilt, which is probably \$500 million, goes to administrative tasks. Forty-two percent of the time we're researching. If we can move from 42 to 35 to 33 to 30, we could save \$1 billion or \$2 billion and take the dollars to fund hundreds, maybe thousands, of multi-year research grants, which we hear so much about declining.

And then the fact that we've been trying to reduce these for a long time. One of my first acts as a senator was to pass legislation requiring the U.S. Department of Education to make a calendar of all of the things that you are supposed to comply with if you are in one of the 6000-plus colleges and universities in America. They have had seven years, and they haven't been able to do it. Well, if they can't do that, how can a small Catholic college in Wisconsin hire somebody to figure it out? And according to this report, there is a new guidance or regulation coming out on average every workday in the U.S. Department of Education. So, you just have that combination of 108-question FAFSA; \$150 million at one university to comply; the National Academy saying 42 percent of time is spent by investigators is spent on administration; and the department itself unable to make a list of all of the rules that it expects you to comply with—that's a pretty good case to make for the people you talk to.

And then I would suggest that a delegation—and again I have discussed this with the chancellors—go see Arne Duncan at the U.S. Department of Education. I meant this isn't all his fault; it's all of our faults among